

9/27/67

Dear Jim,

The May 14 Hubert-Griffin memo fascinates me, *beginning with* from the cover, which I regard as unusual, ~~and~~ I have taken the liberty of marking some of the spots I found particularly interesting.

I think I have more on Alex Gruber. By now, trying to keep so much in *mind* and fatigued as I am, I do not trust my recollection. However, I think there is an Alex Gruber-Oswald rumored connection in Mexico. A *friend* on the west coast either looked him up or had him looked up after we had earlier correspondence. I wrote him as soon as I saw this document (and I think I have others) to get the story straight.

This thing is hell to try and read. I spent two hours on it early this a.m. My eyes now require a change, something not as tough. I'll be going over the other documents as I can and will send you any that seem interesting. There is more Ruby stuff in the Rankin file I was working in.

I have the FBI report (someplace) that places Howard at the jail, etc.

Hubert's 2/13 memo is something I wish I'd had when I wrote Oswald in New Orleans. The reference to Howe seems to be to Kenneth C., one of the agents on the Oswald case whose name is kept very, very quiet. I recall only a single reference to him in the hearings (Paine, EX106) and not a single one in the exhibits.

You may recall my interest in Dean's perjury and the Commission's disinterest from WHITENASH. The enclosed Griffin memo on his Dean conversations and deposition was prepared at the request of Willens, ~~the man who~~ who sent the message by phone through Hubert (who was in on much of this, as the memo shows). I have the two-page Willens memo but am not sending it because I fear I'll run out of this EM dry-copier paper before the supply I ordered yesterday arrives. If this interests you and you want that memo, let me know. The openness of the police fear of damage to the Ruby case and their absence of concern over fraudulent conviction is in keeping with what we know of them. I think Griffin had something in mind here that he was reluctant to put on paper. These are the guys who wanted to appear before the Commission "on an off the record basis."

The Hubert May 5 memo on the police liars and how kindly the Commission felt toward editing sworn testimony reads at the bottom "See P.S. on original." Naturally, there is no "original" in this file and with the P.S. there alone, I do not have it.

It seems that Liebelier wanted heads on the table. His memo of 9/14 interests me. If it doesn't you, perhaps it will entertain you. Oswald had no underground connections because Andrews and one Penn didn't say so? He believed it was Oswald at Mrs. Odio's. His paragraph about believing Oswald was not on the buses reminds me that Peter Kihss ~~for~~ (New York Times) found another Oswald on a later Mexican bus, by the manifest. His paper didn't use it. I have a record of it somewhere. And "Odio may well be right". From the man who never looked for the Hall crew! I recall nothing in Odio's printed testimony on a belief "LHO was a U.S. agent" (p.7). His query, had they seen the full CIA file, and the question, who would attest they had seen the full Bureau file, reminds me of one of the documents I ordered and didn't *get* (and another similar I ordered yesterday) saying the FBI was holding out on the Commission.

I guess that will be all for this batch. Sincerely,